

1. All materials submitted to *Vestnik of St. Petersburg University. Series 7. Geology. Geography* (hereinafter referred to as Series) shall be registered with the secretary of the Series. After submission, the received date should be stated on the paper. The Editor-in-Chief of the Series will make one of the following decisions: accept outright (specifying the publication date) / request a revision / reject outright and inform authors to revise the manuscript no later than 60 days from the received date. Should the decision after review not be made within 60 days from the received date, a notice shall be sent to authors with explanation concerning the reasons for delay.

2. Once submitted, all materials (articles, bibliographical and dissertation reviews, etc.) will be assigned to executive secretary of the Series, who will read the paper and decide whether it is appropriate for the journal and meets the following requirements: article's title should reflect its content clearly; article should not extend beyond the imposed limits on length; appropriate structure; format, keywords and abstracts for review in Russian and English; references; digital data, formulas, calculations, etc.; contact information; authors must provide a consent form expressing their agreement for publication in the Series, etc.

Also, executive secretary and the Editor-in-Chief of the Series will check for plagiarism, i.e. passing off another's works, illustrations, tables etc. as article's authors. The initial assessment should not take more than 15 days from the received date, which is recorded in the journal of entries. Should the article be rejected after initial assessment, a notice will be sent to authors in writing.

3. After submission, all materials must be forwarded to be evaluated and commented upon by a number of independent experts (at least, two experts) within the same field of research, who have a scientific degree of candidate or doctor assigned by leading Russian universities or similar academic degrees assigned by leading foreign universities.

During revision, the articles may be re-revised or undergo an additional revision by either original or new experts, including the cases where authors were invited to submit a revised manuscript, at the Editor-in-Chief of the Series discretion.

4. Should there be no conflict of interest between authors and referees (such as shared affiliations, supervisory or co-author relationship, etc.), referees may be any academic or professional researchers working in the field, including members of the Editorial Boards of the Series, with preference given to external members. At least one of the referees must not be an employee of St. Petersburg State University. The reviewer must notify the Editorial Board of possible conflicts of interest and refuse to serve as a referee. At the submission stage, authors may indicate a limited number of scholars who should not review the paper. Excluded scholars must be identified by name.

5. The reviewer's name is not disclosed to the author, unless otherwise stated with a reviewer in writing.

6. After review, the referees may request changes and suggest improvements to the manuscript, and authors will be sent an author's section of the review with a consolidated list of specific concerns to prepare a revision and if suitable it will then be accepted for publication.

7. During peer review, reviewers will accurately and properly access the manuscript as follows:

- 1) To evaluate the content for scientific value and originality;
- 2) To evaluate the content for information value and originality;
- 3) To disclose relation between the submitted article and literature, publications and up-to-date research in the field;
- 4) To reveal if the article meets all applicable standards of ethics and does not constitute scientific misconduct and breach of publishing ethics;
- 5) To evaluate the content for practical use;

6) To evaluate the content for clear and unambiguous style of writing: the results and conclusions should reflect the findings clearly; the article should meet the general and particular format, language and style requirements; the article uses clear and illegible terminology, tables, diagrams, figures and formulas, footnotes, references, etc.;

7) To evaluate the content for how it entices the audience to read.

Designed by the Editorial Board, the standard form for peer review aims to answer 'yes/no' questions and provide a detailed and in-depth account to assess the paper's suitability for publication in the journal, peer review deadline and terms and conditions, rules of confidentiality, etc.

The review consists of two parts, one of which is intended to be sent to authors, while the other - to the Editorial Board of the Series.

8. After review, the reviewer will make one of the following decisions:

- 1) Accept outright;
- 2) Accept, but request a minor revision at authors' discretion;
- 3) Request a minor or major revision, where authors revise their manuscript to address specific and significant concerns;
- 4) Reject outright with a right for submission of a revised manuscript;
- 5) Reject outright without being entitled to resubmit.

A manuscript may only be revised twice.

The revised manuscript submitted after 4 months from the author's receipt of the review is recognized as a new submission and must be reprocessed anew.

9. The Editorial Board of the Series must protect the confidentiality of the review process with respect to all information involved with a manuscript. The referee must confirm in writing the acceptance of responsibility for keeping undisclosed the reviewed work and its content, as well as whatever facts be disclosed to him related to the author, etc. Discussion of a reviewed article with third parties is not allowed. Before publication, the referee is not permitted to use or refer to the material under consideration.

10. The Editorial Board of the Series specifies the manuscript publication criteria.

11. A positive review report is in itself not sufficient for the article to be accepted for publication. The final decision on publication rests with the Editorial Board of the Series and is recorded in the minutes of the Editorial Board sessions.

12. Originals of review reports are kept by the editors of the Series and copies are kept by the Editorial Board of the Series for a period of three years from the publication date or the date of the decision to reject the manuscript. Review reports advising acceptance or rejection of reviewed articles are to be submitted to *Vestnik of SPbU* along with the materials for the corresponding issue of the respective Series. Should review reports be lacking, or be incomplete, preparation of the issue for final editing and publishing will not be carried out.

***Editor in Chief*** "Geology" - /V.G.Krivovichev /

***Editor in Chief*** "Geography" - /V.V.Dmitriev /

Form to reviewers of articles

|   |  |     |    |
|---|--|-----|----|
| 1   | Is there a conflict of interest between the reviewer and the author / authors?   | Yes | No |
| 2.  | Is there a novelty (originality) of the material?  | Yes | No |
| <i>If Yes, what is the informational and scientific novelty (no more than 500 characters)</i> |  |     |    |
| 3.  | Corresponds whether or not a reviewed material to the current level of research on relevant issues   | Yes | No |
| 4   | meets the article all applicable standards of ethics and does not constitute scientific misconduct and breach of publishing ethics?  | Yes | No |
| <i>If Yes, explain (no more than 500 characters)</i>  |  |     |    |
| 5   | Does the practical importance of the material?   | Yes | No |
| <i>If Yes, to evaluate the content for practical use (no more than 500 characters)</i>        |  |     |    |
| 6   | Whether the findings and conclusions of the data obtained?   | Yes | No |
| 7   | Meets the article to all applicable standards of ethics and does not constitute scientific misconduct and breach of publishing ethics?   | Yes | No |
| 8   | Corresponds or not the content of the article for clear and unambiguous style of writing (the results and conclusions should reflect the findings clearly; the article should meet the general and particular format, language and style requirements; the article uses clear and illegible terminology, tables, diagrams, figures and formulas, footnotes, references, etc.)? | Yes | No |
| 9   | Is whether the peer-reviewed material interest to the reader?  | Yes | No |
| <i>If Yes, what is the interest (no more than 500 characters)</i>                             |  |     |    |
| 10  | Accept outright  | Yes | No |
| 11  | The material can be published with a minor or major revision taking into account comments and suggestions of the reviewer  | Yes | No |
| 12  | Request a minor or major revision, where authors revise their manuscript to address specific and significant concerns  | Yes | No |
| 13  | Reject outright with a right for submission of a revised manuscript  | Yes | No |
| 14  | Reject outright without being entitled to resubmit.  | Yes | No |
| <i>Conclusion of the reviewer (no more than 2,000 characters)</i>                             |  |     |    |